DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 245 EA 011 158

AUTHOR Robinson, Norman
TITLE Patterns of Participatory Management in Schools.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration (Quebec City, Quebec, June 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Assistant Principals; *Decision Making; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Principals; Tables (Data); *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS British Columbia; *Participative Decision Making; *Participative Management

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to determine the actual and preferred decision-making levels of teachers and principals in schools. Subjects included approximately 30 principals and 675 teachers from elementary and secondary schools in a large suburban school district in Vancouver, British Columbia. Subjects completed a questionnaire on decision-making in their schools. Among the findings to emerge from the study was that both elementary and secondary teachers desired more decision-making in schools. Principals and assistant principals were identified as making more decisions that any other group and were on the whole satisfied with their levels of decision-making. Teachers believe that principals' involvement in decision-making is larger than principals perceive it to be, and, conversely, principals believe teachers to have more involvement in decision-making than teachers believe they have. This study confirms the results of earlier studies that showed that preferred levels of teacher participation in decision-making are greater than actual levels of decision-making. It also confirmed earlier findings that teachers' desire for participation in school decision-making varies with the decisional area. The study suggests that more collegial decision-making systems in schools will produce greater teacher satisfaction and organizational productivity. (Author/JM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED165245

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS

by

Norman Robinson
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Robinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Paper Presented at the Annual
Conference of the Canadian Association
for the Study of Educational Administration.

EA 011 158

Quebec City, Quebec June, 1976

# PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS

Norman Robinson
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

## Introduction

Educational researchers have long been concerned with the question of teacher participation in decision-making processes at the school and school district level. A substantial body of knowledge has been accumulated relating to the actual degree of teacher participation in decision-making processes, to the preferred degree of teacher participation, to the decisional areas in which teachers participate, to the decisional areas in which teachers want participation, to teacher characteristics associated with actual and preferred levels of participation, and to the positive and negative outcomes associated with teacher participation in educational decision-making.

In view of this substantial body of existing knowledge concerning teacher participation in decision-making, the question may be raised: why more study on this question? Are not all the answers in? The appropriate response to this query seems to be that new studies are needed because all the answers to the question of teacher participation in decision-making can never be in. It's a dynamic field in which changes are occurring quickly. The teachers that Sharma[1] studied in 1955 in his examination of school decision-making bear little resemblance to the teachers working in

schools in Canada and the U.S.A. in 1976. It is unlikely that these 1976 teachers have the same aspirational levels for decisional participation that the 1955 teachers had. In a similar way, the schools of 1976 and the political and social context in which they operate, are quite different from the 1955 schools and their environments. Thus, constant changes in the nature of teachers and the nature of schools and their environments, mean that the question of teachers' actual and preferred patterns of participation in school decision-making need to be examined periodically. It is only when educational administrators have made available to them current knowledge relating to teachers' actual and preferred levels of participation in school decision-making that administrators are able to design participative management systems in their schools that meet the varying decisional needs of schools and their organizational participants.

This paper presents the results of a study[2] done recently in British Columbia on the question of teacher participation in decision-making at the school level. The study asked teachers and principals to provide information on decisional situations in their own schools. More specifically, teachers and principals were asked to respond to four questions on a series of twenty-three selected decision items. These four questions were:

A. Who <u>primarily</u> <u>makes</u> the decision on this item in your school at the present time?

B. Who <u>should</u> <u>primarily</u> <u>make</u> this decision?

C. What is the <u>present</u> nature of your usual <u>involvement</u> in making this decision?

D. To what extent do you wish to be usually involved in making this decision?

In addition to the above four questions to which all teachers and principals were asked to respond, teachers only were asked two questions on their principals' involvement in school decision-making. These were:

E. What is the present nature of your principal's usual involvement in making this decision?

F. To what extent should your principal be usually involved in making this decision?

The results of this study confirm certain results of a number of earlier studies on shared decision-making in schools. Other results of the study indicate, however, certain changes from previous studies in terms of teachers' actual and preferred patterns of participation in school decision-making.

Previous Research

Over the past twenty-five years a large number of studies have been done on decision-making in education. A substantial number of the studies have focused on the question of teacher participation in school decision-making and the results of these studies have been remarkably consistent. Stated in broad terms, the results of twenty-five years of research on teacher participation in decision-making in schools show that: (1) teachers want more involvement in school decision-making than what they currently have; (2) desire for involvement varies from one decisional area to another; (3) increased involvement of teachers in school

*decision-making produces positive outcomes for both the individual teacher and the school itself; and (4) desire for involvement in school decision-making is associated with certain characteristics of teachers.*

*Perhaps the most consistent finding relating to teacher participation in decision-making is that the preferred or desired level of teacher involvement in school decision-making is higher than the actual level of teacher involvement. Over twenty years ago in a national study done in the United States, Sharma[3] examined the question of who makes various decisions in schools as compared to who should make these decisions. Sharma found that teachers wanted more involvement in decision-making than what they currently had. In other words, teachers felt that they should be making more decisions than they were. It should be noted, however, that Sharma found that teachers did not want a uniformly high degree of involvement in all decisional areas. Interest in involvement was highest in those areas most closely related to classroom work (e.g. selecting curriculum) and lowest in those areas most removed from the classroom (e.g. selection, retention and promotion of teaching personnel). A final finding of Sharma was that teachers were strongly in favour of increased autonomy for the individual school as a decision-making unit within the school district.*

*Two later Canadian studies have reaffirmed Sharma's findings that teachers want more decisional involvement and that the desire for increased involvement varies from one decisional area to another. In a study done in Alberta in*

1969, Simpkins[4] found that teachers were content to see those in administrative positions exercise major decision-making authority in decisional areas central to the definition of school goals and means. At the same time he found evidence of a desire on the part of teachers for more decisional authority in general. Teachers wanted to act as a member of a decisional staff group in task activities such as determination of school rules; but preferred individual decisional authority on classroom matters. Thus, teachers wanted a complex pattern of decision-making in which the degree and kind of involvement varied with the task. In a 1974 study of the decisional aspirations of a sample of British Columbian teachers, Shindler[5] found a strong concern on the part of the individual teacher for participation in decision-making on educational matters both inside and outside the school. Unlike Simpkin's teachers, Shindler's teachers were concerned with decisional involvement in goal setting at the school and school district level. In overall terms, they favoured a substantial reduction in the decisional authority of both school principals and school district officials. Although Shindler's teachers were mostly concerned with increasing their decisional power as individual teachers; they also favoured the transfer of authority in certain decisional areas from the principalship and the central office to formal staff groups within individual schools.

In terms of the preferred model of teacher involvement in school decision-making, research to date shows quite clearly that the model of decision-making involvement most

preferred by teachers is the collegial model. Masse,[6] in a Canadian study done in 1969, found that teachers did not favour complete decisional autonomy for themselves nor simple decisional consultation of teachers by principals. The preferred method of reaching decisions (particularly those of a professional nature) was through collegial collaborative endeavour. Teachers preferred the decisional situation where teachers and principals worked together as colleagues and equals in reaching decisions.

Considerable research has been done that points to the positive benefits accruing to the individual teacher and to the school organization from increased teacher participation in decision-making. As early as 1952, Chase reported that

> "teachers who have the opportunity to participate regularly and actively in making policies are much more likely to be enthusiastic about their school system than those who have limited opportunity to participate."[7]

Other studies done by Sharma,[8] Leiman,[9] Bridges,[10] and Alutto and Belasco[11] all report a direct relationship between teacher satisfaction and teacher participation in decision-making.

Several studies have found teacher participation in decision-making to be related to change and innovation in schools. In a 1965 Illinois study, Johansen[12] found that teacher participation in deciding on curriculum development activities increased the likelihood of future curriculum implementation. Essentially what Johansen found was that teachers who perceived themselves as being influential in the curriculum development process were those teachers most likely to implement the planned curriculum changes.

In a similar study done in 1967 in Wisconsin, McLimans[13] found that the more a teacher perceived himself or herself to be a participant in decision-making, the more likely the teacher was to engage in innovative teaching activities.

Several interesting studies have been done which relate personal and positional characteristics of educators to decision-making in schools. Corriveau,[14] in a Canadian study, found that principals perceive their teachers as being more involved in making school decisions than do the teachers themselves. In a comprehensive study done in 1972 in the United States, Alutto and Belasco[15] found that certain personal characteristics of teachers were related to states of decisional deprivation (actual involvement less than preferred involvement), decisional equilibrium (preferred involvement equal to actual involvement), and decisional saturation (current involvement greater than preferred involvement). These two researchers found that younger male teachers tended to be the most decisionally deprived and older female teachers were the most decisionally saturated. As might be expected, middle-aged teachers of both sexes tended to be teachers who had achieved a state of decisional equilibrium. Age and sex thus tend to be strongly associated with actual and preferred levels of involvement amoung teachers. Alutto and Belasco found also that elementary teachers tended to experience more decisional saturation, while decisional deprivation was more characteristic of teachers in secondary schools.

A more recent study done by Dittrich[16] in 1976 examined decisional deprivation, decisional equilibrium and decisional

saturation in a sample of teachers in an urban B.C. school district. Like Alutto and Belasco, Dittrich found that younger teachers were more decisionally deprived than older teachers. Unlike Alutto and Belasco, however, Dittrich found more decisional deprivation among elementary teachers than among secondary teachers. In addition, Dittrich found little difference between male and female teachers in terms of their decisional states. In the few decisional areas where differences did exist, female teachers were more decisionally deprived than male teachers.

In summary, it can be stated that the educational research on teacher participation in decision-making in schools that has been done over the past twenty-five years has produced four principal general findings. One is that teachers' preferred level of involvement in school decision-making is in most cases greater than their actual level of involvement. The second is that teachers' desires for participation in decision-making varies from decisional area to decisional area. The third is that increased teacher involvement in school decision-making produces positive consequences both for the individual teacher (e.g. higher level of job satisfaction) and for the school organization (e.g. increased innovativeness). The final finding is that the desire for involvement in decision-making on the part of teachers is related to certain personal and positional characteristics of teachers.

## RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This study was carried out in a large suburban school district of Vancouver. A questionnaire (Staff Involvement Questionnaire) was developed to survey teacher and principal opinion on decision-making in schools in the district. A total of twenty-three decision items deemed to be significant to the district's schools were identified. These items were:

| Decision Item Number | Decision Item * |
|---|---|
| 1. | Preparing the Agenda for Staff Meetings |
| 2. | Assigning Pupils to Classes |
| 3. | Supervising Students by Staff |
| 4. | Selecting Supplies, Equipment and Texts |
| 5. | Determining Duties and Assignments for Secretaries |
| 6. | Establishing Policy of Student Attendance |
| 7. | Selecting Curriculum Content for Own Classes |
| 8. | Determining Plan for use of Educational Leadership Funds |
| 9. | Determining Specific Teaching Assignments Within the School |

---

* All twenty-three decision items were generated by a district-wide committee of teachers, principals and central office staff. Some of the items relate to particular district policies and may not be completely clear to people outside the district. For example, decision item number 8 (Determining Plan for Use of Educational Leadership Funds) refers to a district policy under which each school is given a set sum of money for administration and supervision. How this money is spent is at the discretion of the school. A secondary school may decide, for example, to have a principal, a vice-principal, an administrative assistant and no department heads. Another school may decide to have a principal, a vice-principal and seven department heads.

10. Determining School Philosophy
11. Selecting the Principal and/or Vice-Principal
12. Determining Procedures for Reporting to Parents
13. Establishing Discipline Policies
14. Determining the Size of Individual Classes
15. Determining Duties & Assignments for Aides
16. Assessing Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling of Staff Meetings
18. Selecting the Chairperson for Staff Meetings
19. Selecting the Administrative Assistant or Senior Assistant
20. Determining Own Instructional Methods and Techniques
21. Selecting Staff Members
22. Selecting the Team Coordinator or Department Head
23. Spending School Funds

Teachers were asked to respond to each of the twenty-three decision items in terms of the six principal questions outlined earlier. The first two questions

A. Who <u>primarily</u> <u>makes</u> the decision on this item in your school at the present time?

B. Who <u>should</u> <u>primarily</u> <u>make</u> this decision?

sought information on <u>actual</u> and <u>preferred</u> decisional actors in schools. The response choices* for these two questions

---

* A word or two of explanation may be necessary concerning the response choices. First of all, under response choice 10 (other(s)), individuals were free to write in responses not listed under responses 1 to 9 (e.g. counsellors). They were also free to write in two or more response choice numbers (e.g. 2 - Principal, 3 - Vice-Principal, 6 - Staff Committee).

(continued on p. 11)

were as follows:

1. Supervisory personnel outside the school
2. Principal
3. Vice-principal or Senior Assistant
4. Administrative Assistant
5. Department Head or Team Coordinator
6. Staff Committee
7. Majority of Teachers in Staff Meeting
8. Individual Teacher
9. Don't Know
10. Other(s) - please specify

The last four questions

C. What is the present nature of your usual involvement in making this decision?

D. To what extent do you wish to be usually involved in making this decision?

E. What is the present nature of your principal's usual involvement in making this decision?

F. To what extent should your principal be usually involved in making this decision?

sought information on actual and preferred levels of involvement in decision-making on each decision item. To measure level

---

This combination of primary decision-makers is called in the report a Shared Primary Decision-Maker.

Response choice 6 (Staff Committee) refers to a decision-making body found in most B.C. schools that is elected by the teachers in the school. The Staff Committee is a formal staff group that can deal with matters relevant to the school and its operation. In most schools, the principal sits on the Committee as an individual member.

of involvement, a seven-point scale was constructed. The scale attempted to measure involvement in terms of the individual teacher's power to influence the decisional outcome. The seven points on the scale thus measured involvement from "no involvement" through such kinds of involvement as "voting as a group member on the decision alternative chosen" to "make the decision unilaterally". All seven points on the scale are shown below:

1. No involvement
2. To provide information only (facts, opinions, etc.)
3. To participate in generating alternatives (in terms of solutions, choices, policies, etc.)
4. To recommend the preferred alternative (in terms of solution, choice, policy, etc.)
5. To vote as a group member on the decision alternative chosen
6. To participate as a decision-maker in a consensus group decision
7. To make the decision unilaterally

Teachers were thus asked to respond to the twenty-three decision items in terms of their actual and preferred levels of involvement as measured by the seven point involvement scale.

As already indicated, teachers answered all six questions. Principals were asked to respond to only the first four of the above six questions.

Returns were received from forty-one schools (86.7%). Individual teacher returns totalled 657 (72.3%). The percentage rate of returns for principals was 78.1%.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section an attempt is made to answer the questions posed earlier in this study as they relate to each of the twenty-three decision items. The first two questions are:

A. Who primarily makes the decision on this decision item at the present time?

B. Who should make this decision?

In other words, an examination is provided of actual and preferred decision-makers in schools as perceived by teachers.*

### Actual and Preferred Primary Decision-Makers: Secondary Teachers

Table 1 presents a summary of all secondary teachers' responses to the two questions relating to actual and preferred primary decision-makers. This table gives an overall district picture. Differences between secondary schools are not reported in this paper.

In terms of frequency of first choice, the pattern of actual primary decision makers for secondary schools is as follows:

School Administration (Principal/Vice-Principal/ Administrative Assistant)

Decision Items 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23

Staff Committee

Decision Items 1, 8, 18

Individual Teacher

Decision Items 7, 20

---

* Principals also responded to these questions, but for the sake of brevity, their responses to the questions have been omitted from this discussion.

Table 1

ACTUAL AND PREFERRED PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS:

PERCEPTIONS OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

(N=310)

| Decision Items | ACTUAL | PREFERRED |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Staff Meeting Agenda | Staff Committee (33.5) Principal/Vice-Principal (30.4) | Staff Committee (49.7) |
| 2. Assigning Pupils to Classes | Counsellors (58.4) | Counsellors (49.9) |
| 3. Supervising Students by Staff | Principal/Vice-Principal (55.6) | Principal/Vice-Principal (33.2) Staff Committee (19.0) |
| 4. Selecting Texts, Equipment & Supplies | Department Head (27.2) Shared - Dept. Head/Individual Teacher (20.9) | Dept. Head (32.6) Shared - Dept. Head/Individual Teacher (22.9) |
| 5. Determining Duties and Assignments for Secretaries | Principal/Vice-Principal/ Administrative Assistant (59.0) | Principal/Vice-Principal/ Administrative Assistant (49.6) |
| 6. Establishing Policy on Student Attendance | Principal/Vice-Principal (42.3) | Principal/Vice-Principal (27.4) Staff Meeting (19.0) Staff Committee (18.4) |
| 7. Selecting Curriculum Content for Own Classes | Individual Teacher (37.1) Shared - Individual Teacher/ Subject Dept./ B.C. Dept. of Education (22.6) | Shared - Individual Teacher/ Subject Dept./ (31.0) Individual Teacher (30.0) |

NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS *

Table 1

(cont.)

NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Determining Plan for Use of Educational Leadership Funds | Staff Committee (32.6) Staff Meeting (10.6) | Staff Committee (39.7) Staff Meeting (21.6) |
| 9. Determining Specific Teaching Assignments within the School | Principal/Vice-Principal (51.3) | Shared - Individual Teacher/ Department Head/ Principal (32.3) Principal/Vice-Principal (28.0) |
| 10. Determining School Philosophy | Staff Meeting (26.5) Principal (22.9) | Staff Meeting (37.4) Staff Committee (28.4) |
| 11. Selecting the Principal and/ or Vice-Principal | Supervisory Personnel outside the School (85.5) | Supervisory Personnel outside the School (37.4) Shared - Supervisory Personnel Outside the School/ Principal/ Staff Meeting (23.9) |
| 12. Determining Procedures for Reporting to Parents | Principal/Vice-Principal (41.6) | Staff Meeting (25.2) Staff Committee (22.3) |
| 13. Establishing Discipline Policies | Principal/Vice-Principal (50.0) | Principal/Vice-Principal (25.8) Staff Meeting (21.0) Staff Committee (17.1) |
| 14. Determining Size of Individual Classes | Principal/Vice-Principal (32.9) Shared - Supervisory | Shared - Principal/Staff Meeting (23.9) |

Table 1

(cont.)

NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14. (cont.) | Personnel outside the School/ Principal (29.7) | Staff Committee (12.3) |
| 15. Determining Duties and Assignments for Aides | Department Head (24.2) Don't Know (23.9) | Department Head (30.3) Shared - Dept. Head/Individual Teacher (16.5) |
| 16. Assessing Teacher Competence | Principal (54.2) | Principal (32.6) Shared - Principal/Dept. Head/Staff Committee (25.2) |
| 17. Scheduling of Staff Meetings | Principal (33.5) Staff Committee (32.6) | Staff Committee (43.2) Principal (21.9) |
| 18. Selecting the Chairperson for Staff Meetings | Staff Committee (35.8) Principal/Vice-Principal (28.4) | Staff Committee (43.5) Staff Meeting (21.6) |
| 19. Selecting the Administrative Assistant or Senior Assistant | Supervisory Personnel Outside the School (36.8) Principal (16.8) | Shared - Supervisory Personnel Outside the School/Principal /Staff Meeting (22.6) Principal (20.0) |
| 20. Determining Own Instructional Methods & Techniques | Individual Teacher (79.0) | Individual Teacher (74.8) |
| 21. Selecting Staff Members | Principal (50.6) | Shared - Principal/Staff Committee (36.5) Principal (30.5) |

Table 1

(cont.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 22. Selecting the Team Coordinator or Department Head | Principal (58.7) | Shared - Subject Teachers/ Principal (31.9) Principal (27.2) |
| 23. Spending School Funds | Principal/Vice-Principal (46.8) | Shared - Staff Committee/ Principal (25.5) Staff Committee (23.5) |

* In listing the primary decision-maker(s) for each decision item, a sufficient number of decision-makers is listed to give approximately 50% of all teacher responses.

Department Head

Decision Items 4, 15

Supervisory Personnel Outside the School

Decision Items 11, 19

Staff Meeting

Decision Item 10

Counsellors

Decision Item 2

An examination of this listing of primary decision-makers reveals that the principal and his assistants are unquestionably the dominant decisional authorities in schools. On nearly one-half (12 of 23) of the decision items, the school administration is named as the primary decision-makers.

When an examination is made of secondary teachers' preferred primary decision-makers, a quite different picture emerges:

Shared Primary Decision-Makers

Decision Items 7, 9, 14 19, 21, 22, 23

School Administration (Principal/Vice-Principal/ Administrative Assistant)

Decision Items 3, 5, 6, 13, 16

Staff Committee

Decision Items 1, 8, 17, 18

Staff Meeting

Decision Items 10, 12

Department Head

Decision Items 4, 15

Individual Teacher

Decision Item 20

Supervisory Personnel Outside the School

Decision Item 11

Counsellors

Decision Item 2

In terms of preferred primary decision-makers, secondary teachers would like to see the decisional authority of the principal and his assistants substantially reduced in all areas. In addition, a reduction should occur in the decisional authority of supervisory personnel outside the school. Interestingly enough, there is even a small indication that the decisional autonomy of individual teachers should be reduced (e.g. decision item 7). The data reveal quite clearly a teacher preference for greater collegial decision-making operating within the context of an autonomous individual school unit. This is shown by the desire to give greater decisional authority to the Staff Committee and to the Staff Meeting. More importantly however, the desire for greater collegial decision-making is shown by frequent choice of Shared Primary Decision-Makers. Who should participate in the decisional process depends upon the decision item. Essentially, the principle that teachers would like to see followed is decisional involvement guaranteed to those who might be affected by the decision.

Actual and Preferred Primary Decision-Makers: Elementary Teachers

Table 2 shows a summary of elementary teachers' perceptions of actual and preferred primary decision-makers in their schools. As for secondary teachers, the table gives an overall district picture.

Table 2

ACTUAL AND PREFERRED PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS:

PERCEPTIONS OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

(N=347)

| Decision Items | NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS * | |
|---|---|---|
| | ACTUAL | PREFERRED |
| 1. Staff Meeting Agenda | Principal/Vice-Principal (49.4) | Staff Meeting (26.3)<br>Staff Committee (25.1) |
| 2. Assigning Pupils to Classes | Staff Meeting (25.7)<br>Principal (21.6) | Staff Meeting (32.5)<br>Shared - Individual Teacher/ Principal (28.1) |
| 3. Supervising Students by Staff | Principal/Vice-Principal (43.8) | Staff Meeting (48.2) |
| 4. Selecting Texts, Equipment & Supplies | Shared - Individual Teacher/ Principal/ Team Coordinator (22.8) | Staff Meeting (26.0)<br>Shared - Individual Teacher/ Principal/ Team Coordinator (21.3) |
| 5. Determining Duties and Assignments for Secretaries | Principal/Vice-Principal (62.5) | Principal/Vice-Principal (40.2) |
| 6. Establishing Policy on Student Attendance | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| 7. Selecting Curriculum Content for Own Classes | Individual Teacher (52.7) | Individual Teacher (41.4)<br>Shared - Individual |

Table 2

(cont.)

NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. (cont.) | | Teacher/ Grade Level Team Grouping/ Principal (23.1) |
| 8. Determining Plan for Use of Educational Leadership Funds | Staff Meeting (52.1) | Staff Meeting (58.9) |
| 9. Determining Specific Teaching Assignments within the School | Principal (46.7) | Principal (25.1) Shared - Individual Teacher/Principal (23.4) |
| 10. Determining School Philosophy | Staff Meeting (40.5) Principal (18.0) | Staff Meeting (61.2) |
| 11. Selecting the Principal and/ or Vice-Principal | Supervisory Personnel Outside the School (76.9) | Supervisory Personnel Outside the School (31.1) Staff Meeting (20.1) |
| 12. Determining Procedures for Reporting to Parents | Staff Meeting (47.3) | Staff Meeting (56.8) |
| 13. Establishing Discipline Policies | Staff Meeting (29.9) Principal/Vice-Principal (29.3) | Staff Meeting (48.5) |
| 14. Determining Size of Individual Classes | Principal (31.7) Supervisory Personnel Outside the School (21.3) | Staff Meeting (29.6) Shared - Staff Meeting/ Principal (20.1) |

Table 2

(cont.)

NAME AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' CHOICES OF PRIMARY DECISION-MAKERS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 15. Determining Duties and Assignments for Aides | Principal (28.1)<br>Staff Meeting (24.6) | Staff Meeting (43.2)<br>Shared - Staff Meeting/ Principal (13.9) |
| 16. Assessing Teacher Competence | Principal (52.7) | Principal (30.5)<br>Shared - Principal/Team Coordinator/ Staff Committee (28.4) |
| 17. Scheduling of Staff Meetings | Principal (44.1)<br>Staff Meeting (25.4) | Staff Meeting (38.5)<br>Staff Committee (21.0) |
| 18. Selecting the Chairperson for Staff Meetings | Principal (48.8) | Staff Meeting (34.3)<br>Staff Committee (19.2) |
| 19. Selecting the Administrative Assistant or Senior Assistant | Supervisory Personnel Outside the School (28.1)<br>Principal (18.0) | Staff Meeting (17.5)<br>Shared - Staff Meeting/Principal /Staff Committee (17.5)<br>Staff Committee (15.4) |
| 20. Determining Own Instructional Methods & Techniques | Individual Teacher (82.0) | Individual Teacher (78.1) |
| 21. Selecting Staff Members | Principal (35.8)<br>Shared - Principal/Staff Committee (25.7) | Shared - Staff Committee/ Principal (29.6)<br>Staff Committee (27.5) |
| 22. Selecting the Team Coordinator or Department Head | Staff Meeting (28.7)<br>Not Applicable (27.2) | Staff Meeting (36.1) |

Table 2

(cont.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23. Spending School Funds | Staff Meeting (31.7) Principal (21.0) | Staff Meeting (45.0) |

*In listing the primary decision-maker(s) for each item, a sufficient number of decision-makers is listed to give approximately 50% of all teacher responses.

The elementary teachers' first choices for actual primary decision-makers on the twenty-three decision items are as follows:

School Administration (Principal/Vice-Principal)

Decision Items 1, 3, 5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21

Staff Meeting

Decision Items 2, 8, 10, 12, 13, 22, 23

Individual Teacher

Decision Items 7, 20

Supervisory Personnel Outside the School

Decision Items 11, 19

Shared Primary Decision-Makers

Decision Item 4

As was the case with secondary schools, the school administration was perceived by elementary teachers as the dominant decisional authority in their schools.

In terms of frequency of first choice, the pattern of preferred primary decision-makers for elementary schools is as follows:

Staff Meeting

Decision Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23

School Administration (Principal/Vice-Principal)

Decision Items 5, 9, 16

Individual Teacher

Decision Items 7, 20

Supervisory Personnel Outside the School

Decision Item 11

*Shared Primary Decision-Makers*

*Decision Item 4*

*The Staff Meeting emerges as the most preferred vehicle for decision-making in elementary schools. Teachers favour a reduction in the decisional authority of principals, vice-principals, individual teachers, supervisory personnel outside the school. The preferred model of school decision-making is that of the autonomous school unit with a collegial decisional structure.*

*Teachers' Actual and Preferred Levels of Involvement in School Decision-Making*

*One of the principal questions that this study attempted to answer was whether teachers' preferred level of involvement in school decision-making was higher or lower than their actual level of involvement. In probing this question, teachers were asked to report on their actual and preferred level of involvement in terms of the seven point scale which measured degree of involvement in decision-making.*

*Table 3 compares the actual and preferred levels of involvement in school decision-making for secondary teachers. The first column on the left in the table shows level of involvement (very high to very low) based on the mean of the teachers' scores on the individual decision items as measured by the seven point involvement scale. The second column from the left shows the actual level of teacher involvement on each decision item. The third column shows the preferred level of teacher involvement. The last column lists the twenty-three decision items and their numbers.*

Table 3

ACTUAL AND PREFERRED

LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT: SECONDARY TEACHERS (N=310)

| Level of Involvement | Actual Level[a] | Preferred Level[a] |
|---|---|---|
| Very High ($\bar{x}$=5.0+) | 20[b] | 20[b] |
| High ($\bar{x}$=4.0+) | 7 | 7, 4, 10 |
| Average ($\bar{x}$=3.0+) | 4, 10 | 6, 14, 22, 13, 12, 9, 1, 23, 8, 3, 15, 2, 11 |
| Low ($\bar{x}$=2.0+) | 6, 13, 1, 12, 9, 22, 8, 18, 3 | 21, 18, 17, 19, 16, 5 |
| Very Low ($\bar{x}$=1.0+) | 2, 23, 15, 17, 14, 21, 5, 16, 19, 11 | |

a. Decision item numbers are arranged in descending order of magnitude of their means, i.e. from high means to low means.

b. Actual and Preferred levels of involvement do not differ significantly (at the .05 level) on this decision item (Decisional Equilibrium).

On all the remaining decision items, the Preferred level of involvement is significantly higher than the Actual level of involvement (Decisional Deprivation).

Decision Items

1. Staff Meeting Agenda
2. Assigning Pupils to Classes
3. Supervising Students by Staff
4. Selecting Supplies, Etc.
5. Duties for Secretaries
6. Policy on Student Attendance
7. Curriculum Content
8. Educational Leadership Funds
9. Specific Teaching Assignments
10. School Philosophy
11. Principal / Vice-Principal Selection
12. Reporting to Parents
13. Discipline Policies
14. Size of Classes
15. Duties for Aides
16. Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling Staff Meetings
18. Staff Meeting Chairperson
19. Administrative Ass't / Senior Ass't Selection
20. Instructional Methods
21. Staff Member Selection
22. Team Coordinator / Department Head Selection
23. Spending School Funds

The table shows very clearly that the preferred level of teacher involvement is significantly higher than the actual level of involvement in all twenty-three decisional areas, except one. Quite clearly, a rather pronounced state of decisional deprivation exists among secondary teachers.

Table 4 examines teachers' actual and preferred levels of involvement in elementary schools. Once again, as with secondary teachers, a rather pronounced state of decisional deprivation exists. Elementary teachers want more involvement than they currently have in twenty-one of the twenty-three decisional areas. In only one area (Selecting Curriculum Content for Own Classes) does there exist a state of decisional equilibrium (actual and preferred levels of involvement do not differ significantly). In a final area (Determining Own Instructional Methods and Techniques) there exists a state of decisional saturation (preferred level of involvement is significantly higher than actual level of involvement).

A comparison of the secondary teachers' results with the elementary teachers' results reveals several findings: (1) the actual level of involvement of secondary teachers in school decision-making is lower than the actual level of involvement of elementary teachers; (2) the preferred level of involvement of secondary teachers is lower than the preferred level of involvement of elementary teachers; and (3) preferred levels of teacher involvement are substantially higher than actual levels of involvement for both elementary and secondary teachers.

Table 4

ACTUAL AND PREFERRED

LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT: ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

(N=347)

| Level of Involvement | Actual Level[a] | Preferred Level[a] |
|---|---|---|
| Very High ($\bar{x}$=5.0+) | 20[c] | |
| High ($\bar{x}$=4.0+) | 7[b] | 20,[c] 7,[b] 12, 10, 8, 2, 4, 3, 13 |
| Average ($\bar{x}$=3.0+) | 8, 12, 4, 2, 10, 13, 1, 23 | 23, 1, 15, 17, 14, 9, 21, 11, |
| Low ($\bar{x}$=2.0+) | 3, 22, 15, 17, 9, 14 | 22, 18, 5, 19, 6 |
| Very Low ($\bar{x}$=1.0+) | 21, 18, 5, 19, 6, 16, 11 | 16 |

Decision Items

1. Staff Meeting Agenda
2. Assigning Pupils to Classes
3. Supervising Students by Staff
4. Selecting Supplies, etc.
5. Duties for Secretaries
6. Policy on Student Attendance
7. Curriculum Content
8. Educational Leadership Funds
9. Specific Teaching Assignments
10. School Philosophy
11. Principal / Vice-Principal Selection
12. Reporting to Parents
13. Discipline Policies
14. Size of Classes
15. Duties for Aides
16. Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling Staff Meetings
18. Staff Meeting Chairperson
19. Administrative Ass't / Senior Ass't Selection
20. Instructional Methods
21. Staff Member Selection
22. Team Coordinator / Department Head Selection
23. Spending School Funds

a. Decision item numbers are arranged in descending order of magnitude of their means, i.e. from high means to low means.

b. Actual and Preferred levels of involvement do not differ significantly (Decisional Equilibrium).

c. Actual level of involvement is significantly higher than Preferred level of involvement (Decisional Saturation).

On all the remaining decision items, the Preferred level of involvement is significantly higher than the Actual level of involvement (Decisional Deprivation).

*Actual and Preferred Levels of Principal Involvement as Perceived by Teachers*

*Another critical question probed by this study was the question of whether teachers wanted more or less involvement of their principals in school decision-making.*

*The results of this study indicated that teachers in both secondary and elementary schools felt that their principals had a high degree of involvement in a majority of the twenty-three decisional areas. Teachers also indicated that they felt principals should generally have a high degree of involvement in school decision-making; but the current levels of principal involvement in some decisional areas should be adjusted.*

*Table 5 examines more closely the desired level of principal involvement in secondary schools. Teachers would like to see their principals more involved in eleven decisional areas. This finding might appear to be rather surprising in light of the findings in Table 3 which show quite clearly a strong desire for greater teacher involvement in school decision-making. When the results of the two tables are put together, the preferred pattern of decision-making in secondary schools becomes quite clear. What teachers prefer is a pattern of schooldecision-making that brings teachers and principals together as colleagues in a shared decision-making context.*

*Table 6 examines elementary teachers' preferences for their principals' degree of involvement in decision-making. Elementary teachers want their principals more*

Table 5

DESIRED LEVEL OF PRINCIPAL INVOLVEMENT

AS PERCEIVED BY SECONDARY TEACHERS

(N=310)

| Level of Principal Involvement | Decision Items |
|---|---|
| More[a] Principal Involvement Desired | 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20 |
| No Change Desired | 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 23 |
| Less[b] Principal Involvement Desired | 16, 21, 22 |

a. Preferred level of involvement is significantly higher than the Actual level of involvement (at the .05 level).

b. Actual level of involvement is significantly higher than the Preferred level of involvement (at the .05 level).

Decision Items

1. Staff Meeting Agenda
2. Assigning Pupils to Classes
3. Supervising Students by Staff
4. Selecting Supplies, Etc.
5. Duties for Secretaries
6. Policy on Student Attendance
7. Curriculum Content
8. Educational Leadership Funds
9. Specific Teaching Assignments
10. School Philosophy
11. Principal / Vice-Principal Selection
12. Reporting to Parents
13. Discipline Policies
14. Size of Classes
15. Duties for Aides
16. Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling Staff Meetings
18. Staff Meeting Chairperson
19. Administrative Ass't Senior Ass't Selection
20. Instructional Methods
21. Staff Member Selection
22. Team Coordinator / Department Head Selection
23. Spending School Funds

Table 6

DESIRED LEVEL OF PRINCIPAL INVOLVEMENT

AS PERCEIVED BY ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

(N=347)

| Level of Principal Involvement | Decision Items |
|---|---|
| More[a] Principal Involvement Desired | 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 19, 20, 22 |
| No Change Desired | 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 23 |
| Less[b] Principal Involvement Desired | 16, 17, 18 |

a. Preferred level of involvement is significantly higher than the Actual level of involvement (at the .05 level)

b. Actual level of involvement is significantly higher than the Preferred level of involvement (at the .05 level).

Decision Items

1. Staff Meeting Agenda
2. Assigning Pupils to Classes
3. Supervising Students by Staff
4. Selecting Supplies, Etc.
5. Duties for Secretaries
6. Policy on Student Attendance
7. Curriculum Content
8. Educational Leadership Funds
9. Specific Teaching Assignments
10. School Philosophy
11. Principal / Vice-Principal Selection
12. Reporting to Parents
13. Discipline Policies
14. Size of Classes
15. Duties for Aides
16. Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling Staff Meetings
18. Staff Meeting Chairperson
19. Administrative Ass't / Senior Ass't Selection
20. Instructional Methods
21. Staff Member Selection
22. Team Coordinator / Department Head Selection
23. Spending School Funds

involved in school decision-making. The tendency is not as pronounced as it is in secondary schools; but there are still eight decisional areas where teachers would like to see their principals more involved.

It should be noted, however, that there are several areas where teachers would like to see their principals less involved. Both elementary teachers and secondary teachers would like their principals less involved in Decision Item #16 (Assessing Teacher Competence). Elementary teachers would like to see less principal involvement in the scheduling of staff meetings (Decision Item # 17) and selecting the chairperson for staff meetings (Decision Item # 18.

Secondary teachers would like less principal involvement in selecting staff members (Decision Item # 21); and selecting department heads (Decision Item # 22).

Principals' Actual and Preferred Levels of Involvement

To this point, no examination has been made of how principals feel about their own actual and preferred levels of involvement. The first point to be made is that there is relatively little difference between secondary and elementary principals, so results for both groups have been combined. Table 7 shows these results. What is apparent from an inspection of this table is that principals in the main enjoy a state of decisional equilibrium. On nineteen decision items, there is no significant difference between their actual and preferred levels of involvement in decision-making. In only one area (Assessing Teacher Competence)

Table 7

ACTUAL AND PREFERRED

LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT: ALL PRINCIPALS

(N=32)

| Level of Involvement | Decision Items |
|---|---|
| More * Involvement Desired (Decisional Deprivation) | 11, 19, 21 |
| No Change Desired (Decisional Equilibrium) | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23 |
| Less * Involvement Desired (Decisional Saturation) | 16 |

* Significant at the .05 level.

Decision Items

1. Staff Meeting Agenda
2. Assigning Pupils to Classes
3. Supervising Students by Staff
4. Selecting Supplies, Etc.
5. Duties for Secretaries
6. Policy on Student Attendance
7. Curriculum Content
8. Educational Leadership Funds
9. Specific Teaching Assignments
10. School Philosophy
11. Principal / Vice-Principal Selection
12. Reporting to Parents
13. Discipline Policies
14. Size of Classes
15. Duties for Aides
16. Teacher Competence
17. Scheduling Staff Meetings
18. Staff Meeting Chairperson
19. Administrative Ass't / Senior Ass't Selection
20. Instructional Methods
21. Staff Member Selection
22. Team Coordinator / Department Head Selection
23. Spending School Funds

*is less involvement desired. There are three important areas where more involvement is preferred. These are: #11 (Selecting the Principal and/or Vice-Principal); #19 (Selecting the Administrative Assistant or Senior Assistant); and #21 (Selecting Staff Members). Quite clearly then principals are concerned about the need for more involvement in making personnel decisions.*

*One finding that should be noted which is not reported in tabular form anywhere is this paper concerns teachers' and principals' perceptions of each others' actual role in school decision-making. Essentially, the situation is that principals perceive teachers as having more actual involvement in decision-making than do teachers themselves. Conversely, teachers perceive their principals as having greater actual involvement in decision-making than do principals themselves. In short, teachers and principals do not have congruent perceptions on each other's actual role in school decision-making.*

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study sought to provide current information on six basic questions relating to patterns of participatory management in schools.

In this section, three tasks will be undertaken. Firstly, the findings of the study will be summarized. Secondly, comparisons will be drawn between the findings of this study and the findings of previous studies on participatory management in schools; and thirdly, certain implications of the findings for the practice of educational administration will be spelled out.

### Summary

The six questions that this study attempted to find answers to on twenty-three decisional items in schools were:

A. Who primarily makes the decision on this item in your school at the present time?

B. Who should primarily make this decision?

C. What is the present nature of your usual involvement in making this decision?

D. To what extent do you wish to be usually involved in making this decision?

E. What is the present nature of your principal's usual involvement in making this decision?

F. To what extent should your principal be usually involved in making this decision?

Questions A and B explored patterns of actual and preferred primary decision-makers. Questions C, D, E and F explored actual and preferred levels of teacher and

principal involvement in school decision-making.

Actual and Preferred Primary Decision-Makers: Summary of Results

The results relating to actual and preferred primary decision-makers can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. In both secondary and elementary schools, the principal and his assistants are identified as actual primary decision-makers more frequently than any other individual or group.

2. Teachers would like to see a great deal more collegial decision-making in schools. This means a reduction in the decisional authority of the principal, supervisory personnel outside the school, the individual teacher; and a shifting of this authority to staff groups.

3. Teachers do not want principals to be less involved in decision-making; but they do want principals to participate as members of consensual decision-making groups.

4. The question of who the preferred primary decision-maker should be varies from decision item to decision item. In secondary schools, there is a preference for Shared Primary Decision-Makers on a plurality of the decision items. On the other hand in elementary schools, the Staff Meeting is viewed as an important decision-making body whose authority should be expanded.

5. The principal (or principal and vice-principal) is seen as the preferred primary decision-maker quite frequently (see decision items 5, 9, 16 for elementary schools and decision items 3, 5, 6, 13, 16 for secondary

schools). Even in these decisional areas, however, teachers are not willing to see the principal exercise unilateral decision-making authority; but want the principal to function within a consensual decision-making context.

Teachers' and Principals' Actual and Preferred Levels of Involvement: Summary of Results

The results relating to teachers' and principals' actual and preferred levels of involvement in decision-making can be summarized as follows:

1. In terms of actual levels of involvement in school decision-making, elementary teachers are more involved than secondary teachers.

2. In terms of preferred levels of involvement, elementary teachers prefer a higher level of involvement than do secondary teachers.

3. Both elementary and secondary teachers would like to be more involved in school decision-making than they currently are. In other words, pronounced decisicnal deprivation is found among both groups.

4. Both elementary and secondary teachers would like to see more principal involvement in decision-making in a majority of decisional areas.

5. Both elementary and secondary principals are currently experiencing decisional equilibrium in most decisional areas. One notable exception is in the area of personnel selection, where there is a pronounced feeling of decisional deprivation.

6. Principals perceive teachers as having more actual involvement in decision-making than do teachers themselves.

7. Teachers perceive their principals as having greater actual involvement than do principals themselves.

Conclusions and Implications

This study confirms the results of earlier studies (e.g. Sharma,[17] Simpkins,[18] Shindler[19]) which have shown that preferred levels of teacher participation in decision-making are greater than actual levels of participation. The study also confirms the finding of earlier studies that teacher desire for participation in school decision-making varies with the decisional area.

What does emerge from this study (in contrast to earlier studies) is a much stronger desire on the part of teachers for school structures that emphasize collegial decision-making on a wide array of decisional issues. Unlike Sharma's teachers in 1955, the teachers in this study do want to be decisionally involved in a substantial number of concerns less directly related to the classroom (e.g. selection of staff). Unlike Simpkin's teachers in 1969 and Shindler's teachers in 1974, the teachers in this study were less interested in increasing the decisional autonomy of the individual teacher; and instead more interested in increasing the decisional authority of staff groups. What emerges from this study is a clear statement of teacher preference for a pattern of participatory management in schools that emphasizes collegial decision-making processes.

Teachers also want individual school units to be able to function in a relatively independent manner within the school district context. Currently, teachers see principals as the dominant decisional actors in schools. The findings of this study suggest strongly that teachers are not satisfied with this traditional hierarchical model of school organization in which the principal is the major primary decision-maker.

There is a teacher demand for a move away from the traditional hierarchical model of school toward a more collegially-oriented type of school organization. This is a demand that could produce decided benefits for schools.

The collegial type school organization that the teachers in this study want closely resembles Moeller and Mahan's "faculty team",[20] Blake and Mouton's 9/9 organization type,[21] and Likert's System 4.[22] All of the above three models of organization emphasize shared decision-making. In addition, they all emphasize confidence and trust between subordinates and superordinates; effective upward and downward communication; group goal setting; and collective responsibility for processes and products.

The challenge ahead for practicing educational administrators appears to be that of designing school organizational systems that will recognize teachers' aspirations for greater involvement in school decision-making. Teachers want school decisional structures that stress mutual trust, confidence, consensual processes and collective responsibility. If administrators prove to be

*capable of designing collegial-type school structures, the benefits to schools are likely to be substantial both in terms of member satisfaction*[23] *and organizational productivity.*[24]

## REFERENCES


1. C. L. Sharma, "Who Should Make What Decisions?", Administrator's Notebook, (April, 1955).

2. N. Robinson, Staff Involvement in Decision-Making in North Vancouver Schools (Burnaby: Simon Fraser University, 1976).

3. Sharma, op. cit.

4. W. S. Simkins and D. Friesen, "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making", The Canadian Administrator, January, 1969).

5. W. R. Shindler, "A Study of Teacher Perception of Actual and preferred practices in School Decision-Making by Individual Teachers, Formal Staff Groups, and Higher Official Authority," (unpublished Master's project, Simon Fraser University, 1974).

6. D. Masse, "Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes", (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Edmonton, The University of Alberta, 1969).

7. Francis S. Chase, "The Teacher and Policy Making: How Democratic Can You Get?", Administrator's Notebook, (May, 1952).

8. Sharma, op. cit.

9. H. I. Leiman, "A Study of Teacher Attitudes and Morale as Related to Participation in Administration." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1961).

10. E. M. Bridges, "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making", Administrator's Notebook, XII (May 1964).

11. J. A. Alutto and J. A. Belasco, "Patterns of Teachers Participation in School System Decision-Making", Educational Administration Quarterly, IX (Winter, 1972), pp. 27-41.

12. J. H. Johansen, "An Investigation of the Relationships Between Teachers' Perceptions of Authoritative Influences in Local Curriculum Decision-Making and Curriculum Implementation", (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1965).

13. D. F. McLimans, "Teacher Innovativeness", (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1967).

14. R. L. Corriveau, "A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Actual and Preferred Degree of Teacher Participation in a Number of Decision", (unpublished Master's thesis, Edmonton, The University of Alberta, 1969).

15. Allutto and Belasco, op. cit.

16. G. Dittrich, "A Study of Actual and Preferred Decision-Makers in a Lower Mainland B.C. School District", (unpublished Master's project, Burnaby, Simon Fraser University, 1976).

17. Sharma, op. cit.

18. Simpkins, op. cit.

19. Shindler, op. cit.

20. G. H. Moeller and D. J. Mahan, The Faculty Team, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1971).

21. R. Blake and J. Mouton, The Managerial Grid, (Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964).

22. R. Likert, The Human Organization, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

23. Moeller and Mahan, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

24. T. J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 123-124.